

## **CEBAF Users Group Board of Directors Meeting Minutes from UGBOD meeting, January 28, 2005**

### **UGBOD Present:**

**Paul Stoler (Chair), Gordon Cates (Chair-Elect), David Armstrong, J.P. Chen, Ron Gilman, Cynthia Keppel, Marc Vanderhagen, Sue Ewing (Interim Sec/Treas), John Arrington, Peter Monaghan, Julie Roche.**

### **Jefferson Lab Representatives Present:**

**Christoph Leemann (Director), Allison Lung (Assistant Director), Larry Cardman (Physics Asso. Dir.), Dennis Skopik (Deputy Asso. Dir.), Kees de Jager (Hall A), Volker Burkert (Hall B), Rolf Ent (Hall C), Elton Smith (Hall D), Tony Thomas (Chief Scientist).**

### **SURA Representatives Present:**

**Jerry Drayer (Pres.), Elizabeth Lawson (Sec.), Steve Wallace (BOT), June Matthews (BOT), Alex Dzierba (BOT).**

### **Executive Session:**

- Chair, Paul Stoler, stated question UGBOD wanted to relate to management - given the sense of uneasiness at the Lab – “What can the Users do to help the Lab achieve its goals?”
- The board agreed that Administration needs to make sure the Users know what is going on at the Lab – be informed.
- The board agreed there is a lack of communication from Administration to Users.
- All agreed that the UGBOD needs to be consulted on all Lab activities that ultimately pertain to Users before decisions are made.
- The board stated that through polling numerous Users, all stated there was a definite air of defensiveness by Administration towards the Users and staff.
- All agreed that this defensiveness is causing aggression in Users and staff, especially Physics division.
- The Board was very concerned that the Users were not being informed or included in the decision making for the 12 GeV upgrade. Also feels that Physics Division is not being included or utilized for the upgrade decisions pertaining to the science and the halls. The Users are very concerned about total dollars being

- requested for the upgrade and the scenarios of what will be cut given the budget constraints.
- All agreed they needed more information pertaining to the upgrade and agreed that Hall D drove the upgrade and realized that there was not presently a representative of Hall D on the UGBOD and Hall D is not integrated into the community. 12 GeV sold to Washington on “Glue-X.”
  - Another source of frustration of Users is that sources of funds being cut from certain areas then do not appear available for upgrades to halls.

### **Open Discussions:**

- When Christoph came in to address the UGBOD, Paul related to Christoph that given the sense of defensiveness and aggression at the Lab, the UGBOD wanted to know what part the Users could play in helping to achieve the goals of the Lab and mend these problems.
- Christoph put addressing this question aside and began talking for 30 minutes about safety at the Lab, the UGBOD is aware of the importance of safety at the Lab, but was very annoyed at the brushoff of their direct concerns. Again, the board related the disconnect between the Lab and Users when Christoph mentioned the importance of completing the Safety Survey sent out – the board remarked that the message was addressed to staff not Users so the Users ignored the message – yet another disconnect with the Users.
- When asked direct questions about the 12 GeV Upgrade – Christoph told UGBOD that Allison Lung, 12GeV project manager, would be answering all questions pertaining to that subject during her upcoming presentation.
- Christoph pushed the effort for the Users to come up with efforts to help get others excited about the science here at the Lab. Clearly stated how important it was to communicate the User’s excitement of physics to DoE.
- UGBOD asked how – Christoph said to directly telephone Dennis Kovar and discuss each one’s personal opinions on the science. Organize a meeting with Users and/or Lab management and Ray Orbach to discuss the science. Christoph charged the UGBOD and the Users to come up with creative ways to communicate physics to all of the upper level individuals, etc. Need to work hard to have well developed ways of explaining our science in an effective/clear/simple manner. He said this well developed message was needed but not in February.
- Gordon asked why not in February – CL replied that the message would be about nuclear physics as a whole after February and not just JLAB.
- Per Christoph, the Lab has interviewed professional consultants for potential help with out-reach strategy at selling the Lab’s science – funds for this will not come out of science money.
- Alex Dzierba stated that it would be helpful if articles about our science were in publications such as – New York Times, Scientific America, or even a PBS “Nova” Show. He also mentioned forming a partnership with CLEO to insure worldwide interest.

- June Mathews added that Fermi and SLAC had much more concentrated and organized Users Group for meeting/lobbying the politicians.
- Christoph mentioned that BNL and JLAB should talk with each other to establish ways of communicating Physics.
- Christoph summarized as – essential to make case for nuclear physics on broad basis, make strategy for long term, support Office of Science as a whole.
- Gordon asked – how coupled the Lab is with Sen. Warner – CL said that we have been invited to present to the Senator.

### **Updates on 12GeV Upgrade by Allison Lung:**

- Paul conveyed to Allison the following regarding the upgrade:
  - The Users wish to help with the upgrade procedures
  - The Users need to be informed
  - The Users need to be included in procedures for strategy/producing papers, etc.
  - How can we help?
- Tony Thomas asked how the UGBOD communicates information to the rest of the User community – GC/PS replied – poll users from each hall etc, and bring their questions to the UGBOD meetings, email the community as a whole, and circulate the UGBOD meeting minutes.
- Allison reported:
  - R&D Activities progressing well
  - Accelerator – testing FEL and upgrade cryomodules
  - Civil: Review of civil construction plan.
  - Experimental Equipment: superconducting magnets, detector prototyping, feasibility/test of superconducting cable/design & prototype of SKA, silicon trailer.
- Key events:
  - Glue X Detector Review
  - Glue X Solenoid Assessment
  - Alternative Analysis – required by DoE- hall layouts- why is best option
    - Reconfirmed base design of machine and location of Hall D
  - Spectrometer Options
    - Reviewed spec. combinations to optimize science reach
    - Director's Council will discuss project impact
  - PAC 27 Review
    - “new” science for CDR
- Upcoming Events
  - Deliver draft project CDR to DoE site office

- DoE review of 12 GeV science programs (04/05)
  - Upgrade cryomodule design review (04/05)
  - Director's project review – Lehman dry run (05/05)
  - Lehman cost and schedule review (07/05)
  - DoE: Office of Science ESAAB review for CD-1 approval (09/05)
- Can only spend PED funds once CD-1 is approved
- Project on schedule for CD-1 approval in September – schedule and budget very tight
- UGBOD concerns (Nov)
  - Talk at the Hall A and Hall C collaboration meeting
  - Monthly telephone conference with user reps/lab mgmt/proj. mgmt
  - Update webpage – new articles and user feedback for collaboration and project page
- AL User Involvement
  - UGBOD must communicate with Lab/Project Mgmt.
  - User involvement
  - Mobilize political support
    - Paul & Gordon involved in development of strategy with SURA Lobbyist
    - Need to establish connections with Foreign governments and agencies
    - DoE will not be able to find all the funds to do all the upgrade
    - We need to try and find other outside sources of funding to complete the project.
- Elton Smith – need to incorporate this into mechanism of communication
  - How do we show we have outside sources (e.g. man-power)?
- Paul Stoler – People are concerned about how much funding we will ask for? There is anxiety over scientific program in that ALL are not being included in the primary CD-1 preparation.
- AL – Not yet discussed the final “box” with DoE. If we try to do everything, we are WELL OUTSIDE the box – the risk too great to lose the project.
- GC – what is the range?
- CL – Not for discussion today – only when I've made up my mind.
- GC – User's perception – want to be creative to help bring project to Washington but need guidance on what we have to work with.
- AL – Four Factors for total project cost above and beyond the basic costs (materials, labor, etc) eg. 25-35% of budget must be contingency, overhead, up to 10%
  - Small teams of Lab people on committees with other Labs looking at the process they went through.
- CL – More will be known in a couple of weeks time.

## **Updates by Larry Cardman:**

- Post Pac 27 Update.
  - DoE wants executive summary for body of CDR
  - Evolution of proposed CDR science structure
    - PAC provided review of science for upgrade plans
    - Is equipment matched to science?
    - Drawbacks of proposal configurations
- Preliminary Recommendations
  - New subtitle structure better
  - 3D quark/gluon structure of nucleon good but needs to be made more transparent
  - nuclei – work in progress
  - symmetry tests good but not yet ready for prime time
  - new framework is improvement over pCDR
- Recommended
  - QCD in Confinement Regime
  - Fundamental Structure of Nuclear Building Blocks
  - Physics of Nuclei
  - Symmetry Tests in Nuclei
- LC – PAC 23 recommended that the major components in all four halls be implemented – need to insure we optimize the physics capabilities of upgrade in likely event of budget constraints.
- Possibilities
  - Location of Hall D – in Hall A or behind Hall B
  - Upgrade only one high luminosity hall
  - Staged upgrade to CLAS
  - Staged upgrade to Glue X
- Presents advantages and disadvantages – disadvantages outweigh advantages so leave Hall D in original location with full 12 GeV beam.
- JPC – Advantages and disadvantages and rough estimate of saving 10-15 million by only delivering 11 GeV – upgrade one luminosity hall.
- AL – project team is still doing analysis for all possibilities (wishes) even if it is in a longer term plan.
- LC – 12 GeV in all three endstations (with B->D) uses up all savings – might be outside budget.
- AL – cost, technical, schedule implications are very important. Might not be able to keep the current review schedule in going forward with this plan (12 GeV x 3)
- LC – cannot do now as it might jeopardize the whole project. Can still investigate doing this after CD-1 approval.
- JPC – makes point that users STILL in dark as we still have partial information so we cannot make suggestions as they then do not appear reasonable – but we have no idea what then is reasonable.

- GC – need numbers in same “units” (i.e. loaded, un-loaded) to be able to think about comparing different configurations.
- PS – the User community (eg. Hall A) continuously considering ideas for proposals – it’ll still be a high luminosity hall – do not want to give the impression that we are shutting out that creativity.
- RG – After 5 years, new experiments/2<sup>nd</sup> generation will replace proposals and we do not get a chance to run the program
- AL – excellent chance to ask DoE for more beam running time.
- JPC – going through a well-defined process for defining project – but is not necessary – the end of the story – as time goes on – it might be better or worse.
- JPC – should push maximum physics output – not is some review process.
- RG – 12 years ago we thought some of the detectors were descope and at some point would be built – same thing might happen now.
- LC – project sold as “hybrid mesons” and “hadron structure” – need minimum equipment for these goals – Glue X, upgraded CLAS and one upgraded high luminosity hall.
- LC – if we get cut say 15% then we could have to rethink the conceptual design again based on budget constraints.
- GC – after CD-1 will there be opportunity to revise the designs/plans?
- CL – things get harder/move forward as the process goes forward – still can get things revised at any stage.
- RE – If we get Hall D, CLAS x 12, new spectrometer, still have one hall to do other experiments.
- VB – Is it a possibility of having the project funded by additional capital equipment?
- RG – Non-upgrade of one hall discourages users – may not be able to complete physics program.
- LC – scientific justification has evolved but viewed from DoE – it has NOT.
- DA – Can anyone assure us the current plan will fit in the box?
- AL – No
- DA – What do we do if one high luminosity hall and hall D and CLAS x12 does not fit into the DoE box?
- LC – original project cost ~ \$100M – Herman Gruner – rather do nothing than something?
- JPC – Why has accelerator not been squeezed as much as physics division?
- AL – Yes they have – expect accelerator division are looking at alternatives.
- LC – total cost of experimental equipment is more than cost of accelerator upgrade.

### **Working Lunch:**

- SURA Thesis Prize
  - How to divide up the time, etc.
- SURA Fellowship – GC to help SURS choose
- **UGBOD Secretary – Sue Ewing nominated and voted in.**

- Annual Meeting
  - GC spoke to many people on conflicting dates etc. – will speak to prospective speakers and get back with UGBOD
  - Tentative dates – June 1, 2, 3, 2005
  - Would like to send announcement out week of Feb. 1, 2005.
  - Intersperse funding talks with physics talks
  - Need to get all users, grad students, etc. to attend
  - Title of talk to remain “Challenges in QCD”
  - Need parallel talks
  - Star Collab, quark gluon plasma, RHIC, neutrino, PREX, high x physics, LHC email GC with list of suggested topics.

**User Issues – Administration Division present:**

- SURA Residence Facility Increase
  - KC – discuss with Jerry Draayer – SURA issue
- User Liaison Office Changes
  - CK – Main point is that NO user was ever told about change – plenty of hassle and attitude problems from higher up when questions were asked by users. I found out when I brought a highly respected group from Japan and a Lab Director. into the office the week of the change and no one knew what they were doing - not that they were not polite and trying to help they just did not know what to do. It would have helped tremendously if I had known ahead so I wouldn't have been as confused and the new people in the office. I could have explained the situation of new people and the whole situation could have been avoided for the Users.
  - DS – Aspects changed to HR – badging, training, immigration, insurance, registration
  - GC – asked Christoph about change – not really receptive – made some assurances
  - What's left in Physics Division?
  - DS – PAC, UGBOD, Student Affairs, Experiment Databases, etc.
  - PS – Christoph gave a pretty poor response to our request for discussion. As users, we are always told AFTER-THE-FACT!! Important to include (or at least ask the users) in deciding issues which deeply affect the users.
  - KC – There was an agreement with DS & LC when the change over would occur but it was changed at the last hour – had to scramble to make changes – it was bumpy.
  - KC – staff making change over – hopefully, future pieces will be more transparent.
  - GC – Who is charting the course of the 12 GeV physics upgrade? Not Cl, not AL – lab management does not reflect science/user issues. What are Larry and Tony doing? Why are they not involved?
  - JPC – Should have a UGBOD contact person for all institutional changes.
  - PS – agree – Perhaps the chair?

- RG – New area of responsibility with new board member?
- DA – Quality of Life issues – John Arrington?
- PS – Someone to talk/liaison with administration?
- DA – Should routinely invite “Admin” group to our meetings.
- User Space
  - CK – Plenty of communication and miscommunication – cubicles in VARC – door not necessarily lockable.
  - KC – cannot write that lockable doors are a done deal as it must come out of contingency
  - CK – still NOT clear if doors and locks are still going to happen – not heard back from request for office breakdown of large 23 person area on plan – space will be divided up among halls for hall leaders to designate who goes where. Poor feedback from Admin. on user issues – user issues seem unimportant.
  - JPC – users do not use web calendar – Lab depends on communicating through web calendar does not think about users- need emails for communication sent directly to users.
  - KC, CK, PS, - communication issues to be resolved.
- SURA Issues w/Jerry Draayer:
  - Increase of Res Fac Rates
    - JD explained that up until lately and deficit was covered – now that it is not the rates needed to reflect a charge where SURA will at least break even and keep the rates under local lodging facilities.
    - PS – Users very satisfied with ResFac and the way it is run.
  - DoE Contract Competition
    - JD – SURA has run JLab for 20+ years and has not been forced to take a hard look at management at the Lab.
    - General approach is to use this opportunity to make things better (hired consultants to help look at our strengths and weaknesses)
    - Will partner with CSC, Computer Sciences Corporation for contract
    - 8 companies were evaluated and interviewed – LSC and Raytheon were finalists along with CSC – they will not interview with science but help the Lab wherever they can.
    - DoE give SURA a performance based fee – SURA will split fee with CSC.
    - CSC will use JLab to enhance their reputation with government contracts – useful in other contract competition.
    - Industry partner will help move technology to commercialization.
    - Intellectual property will track fee-split on agreement with SURA and CSC.
    - CSC expected to help JLab maintain and exceed performance on reviews.



- KC – CSC can help integrate the administration information systems. Hopefully, CSC will train JLab people in using the better systems.
  - JD - Entity that manages Lab will have a new name, new structure, etc. The hope is that this will only improve what we see on the ground. Expect a tighter ship to maximize the dollars in science.
  - CSC & SURA married for length of contract.
  - KC – waiting on RFP in March – 45 days to respond. Tight timeline, eg. Current contract ends September and has already been extended by one year.
  - JD – Working hard to put together RFP in anticipation of it.
  - JPC – How will the budget get squeezed?
  - JD – JLab employees have a very good benefits package. We do not wish to jeopardize this with CSC.
  - PS – SURA's reduced management fees will result in what reduction effect to the Lab.
  - JD – SURA has to look at itself to see if things can be maintained without any curtailment in User support. Everyone in SURA and JLab management are aligned in support of contract competition.
  - JD – we need UGBOD to look at yourselves and ask how you function and are you functioning clearly? Wish to make sure the Users are consulted in going forward and that Users can provide input in doing their job better. SURA is committed to making sure JLab “Best in Class” science stays that way – propose a Science Council.
  - SPAG – Science Policy Advisory Group – rarely met – not institutionalized.
  - GC – Users are worried that for 12 GeV upgrade, no physics division people are involved in the decision making process. Physics related decisions. Especially Larry, Dennis, Tony Thomas. Do you hear what I am saying?
  - JD – I hear what you are saying – and I hope you will be in a phone conversation with me very soon on this subject.
  - JD – How can the UGBOD be more effective?
    - Convince users to move together with SURA & CSC in DoE competition
    - Do not wish to mess around with physics at JLab.
  - JM – Intend that none of the current JLab functions will disappear, will be preserved eg. Bridge appointments – not high dollar cost but are extremely valuable.
- User Issues
    - APS Satellite Meeting
      - CK with help of RG and DA will head
    - PAC Recommendations
      - LC –someone who is expert in hadronic physics but without being biased electromagnetic physics. Someone with expertise on

extracting information from large amounts of data. Need suggestions ASAP.

- PS – send ideas to Sue – GC & PS look at names – consult with UGBOD and if agree – talk to Larry.
- UGBOD Elections
  - Need nominating committee – Elton Smith, Doug Higinbotham, Alan Nathan, Charlie Glashauser, Dave Mack.
  - Will talk with committee nominees and go from there.
- PAC online submittals
  - Conclusion is to make online forms available in work form along with pdf and ps. DA will test new cover sheets when posted.
- Org. of User Information Meeting for 12 GeV upgrade
  - PS- organize an open forum for any user to be informed on the 12 GeV upgrade
  - LC – budget numbers still vague – numbers as to how to “bill” the project budget still vague
    - Need physics project manager to work with other project managers and provide voice for physics division on upgrade
  - GC – No physics project manager – not soliciting information from physics division – tight timeline.
  - LC – 1<sup>st</sup> CDR draft – 31<sup>st</sup> Jan
    - JLab internal review – 1<sup>st</sup> Feb – 23<sup>rd</sup> Feb
    - Draft review completed – 24<sup>th</sup> Feb
  - GC – CL said we would know more in 2 weeks
  - RG/DA – Can we get access to CDR Draft?
  - LC – Should have opportunity to ask/comment on CDR draft before final draft is prepared.
  - PS – propose at the moment not to organize an open meeting.
- **Executive Session**
  - Issues to ask JLab management
    - No physics project manager
    - No physics division input
    - Temporary physics project manager
    - PS – users do not feel included in the physics decision making processes for the upgrade
    - Wish to have opportunity to review the draft CDR

### **Closeout with management**

- Christoph already left for the day – did not inform UGBOD
- Allison came in and Roy Whitney came late for closeout
  - Physics project manager for upgrade – have tried without success even for temporary – are still working on it.
  - AL – physics division does have input – all halls are working on components – Larry and Tony do have some input – all persons on

Director's Council have been given or have access to sheets with numbers for the upgrade. Users will have the opportunity to review and comment on the draft CDR.

Meeting is adjourned.

**Official Minutes of UGBOD Meeting, January 28, 2005:**

---

Susan F. Ewing, Secretary/Treasurer

---

Date